

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 were pending in the application.

Claims 4, 6-9, 13-15 and 17-23 are withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended.

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12 and 16 are rejected.

**Amended Claims 1 and 10**

Claims 1 and 10 are amended to require that the paint composition is a **faux effect paint composition**. This limitation is now a feature of the claims. As such it distinguishes from the prior art.

The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the above amendment even though after Final. As stated by the Examiner in her last response, the Examiner expressly states (see page 6, item 9 of the Final Rejection of April 3, 2007) that the arguments presented by the Applicants rely on a feature which is not part of the claims.

Thus the Applicants believe they are complying with 35 CFR 1.116 in introducing this amendment after Final. That is the Applicants have introduced the limitation "faux effect" into claims 1 and 10. Thus arguments #1 through #3 filed in the last response (January 5, 2007) are now relevant to the scope of the present claims.

Support for this amendment may be found in the title and the first paragraph of page 2 of the disclosure.

**Restriction Requirement**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for her explanation of the restriction requirement and why claims 4, 6-9, 13-15 and 17-23 are excluded pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

However, should the generic claims 1 and 10 be allowed, Applicants will request that the dependent claims (4, 6-9 and 13-15) be rejoined with 1-3, 5, 10-12 and 15 and also be allowed.

**35 USC 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in light of EP 01277808.

The Examiner alleges that EP 01277808 teaches the employ of the urea-aldehyde pigment granules in water-based paints. The Examiner specifically refers to paragraph [0002]. Therefore, the Examiner further points out that the formulation of aqueous resin or coating systems utilizing the claimed urea-aldehyde pigments would have been obvious to the ordinary practitioner of this art.

Applicants have previously argued that the reference fails to show certain features of the Applicant's invention.

The Applicants refer to the arguments of record previously submitted under #1, #2 and #3 in the last Applicant Response of record on January 5, 2007. Examiner points out that the features upon which the Applicant relies (i.e. faux effect) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 (all considered claims depend therefrom) to include the limitation "faux effect" to clarify the type of paint composition.

As the limitation "faux effect" is now a feature upon which the Applicants arguments rely, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the earlier arguments of January 5, 2007.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 10-12 and 16 is respectfully solicited in light of the remarks and amendments *supra*.

Since there are no other grounds of objection or rejection, passage of this application to issue with claims 1-3, 5, 10-12 and 16 is earnestly solicited.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. In the event that minor amendments will further prosecution, Applicants request that the examiner contact the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Sheila A. Loggins  
Agent for Applicants  
Reg. No. 56,221

Ciba Specialty Chemicals Corporation  
540 White Plains Road  
Tarrytown, New York 10591  
(914) 785-2768  
SAL\22844R3.doc